



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/876,361	06/07/2001	Matthew R. Labarge	60001.0044US01/MS#154687.	9164

7590 08/10/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.
P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

SPOONER, LAMONT M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2626

DATE MAILED: 08/10/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/876,361	Applicant(s) LABARGE, MATTHEW R.	
	Examiner Lamont M. Spooner	Art Unit 2626	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 May 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 07 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 5/22/06 has been entered.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments filed 5/22/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. More specifically, regarding post, "Nowhere in Lakritz is an HTML formatted document requiring remote processing sent as a data body in an HTTP POST request, the Examiner cannot concur. As the previously cited sections discuss (C.15.lines 10-26-his post, language parameters are in the post request, including "GET/cnv.post/English...", posting, the entity containing the parameters specifying the posted document, further, C.19.lines 65-C.20.line 8-in the direction to server, with

language parameters, from the browser, C.9.lines 15-25, 64-C.10.line 20-
his posted and teaching of posted document as it relates to HTML).

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to the amended claims have been
considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the
basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being
unpatentable over Lakritz (US 6,526,426) in view of Lissauer (US
6,466,900).

As per **claims 10, 1, 17, 18 and 2**, Lakritz discloses a method for
submitting a richly-formatted document for translation processing,
comprising the steps of:

receiving edits from a user for a pre-translated document, wherein the
edits include the addition of text, formatting, and a non-text entry to the pre-
translated document (C.7.lines 13-20-word processing as related to form

filling, and well known to include text, formatting, and non-text entries, C.7.lines 32-35).

receiving a request to translate the pre-translated document from a first language to a second language (ibid, C.9.lines 1-3-his “need to be translated” documents);

receiving a list of translation services for translating a document from a first language to a second language (C.9.lines 8-26-his “job tickets” which have a reference to a translation resource);

receiving a selection a translation service from the list of translation services (C.9.line 57-C.10.line 9-his selected appropriate translation resource);

requesting an identification for the selected translation service (C.16.lines 25-35-his requesting of a URL for the selected translation service, specifying the language selection);

saving the pre-translated document, including the text entries, the non-text entries (from the pre-translated document), and the formatting in the pre-translated document, to a temporary storage medium (C.7.lines 30-35, C.9.lines 1-3-his translation queues);

saving the pre-translated document as an HTML document, including saving a path from the HTML document to the non-text entry (entries) saved in the temporary storage medium (ibid, C.10.lines 15-20 “the documents original format HTML”, Fig 12);

sending the HTML document to the selected translation service via the identification for the selected translation service (ibid, C.10.lines 7-9);

receiving a translated HTML document from the selected translation service (ibid, C.12.lines 35-58, Fig. 12 items 1210-1215); and

displaying the translated HTML document (ibid, C.4.lines 61-65, “translated documents on Web site”-displayed on Web site).

but lacks saving paths from the HTML document to the non-text entry (entries) saved in the temporary storage medium, *instead of saving the non-text entry (entries) in the HTML document.*

However, Lissauer teaches the lacking elements, saving path...instead..., (C.4.lines 15-29-“it only stores the path ...”). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Lakritz’s stored document by storing only the paths to non-text entry (entries). The motivation for doing so would have been to save memory space.

As per **claims 11, 3 and 19**, Lakritz discloses dependent claims 10 and 1, and further teaches wherein the step of displaying the translated HTML document further comprises the steps of:

using the path to the non-text entry (entries) saved in the translated HTML document to call the non-text entry (entries), (C.7.lines 10-12-his static HTML content, C.5.lines 7-11 and C.6.lines 29-C.7.line 12, inherently called to complete the translation in order to have the translated document which includes the “language-specific elements, and static HTML content”); and

displaying the translated HTML document with the non-text entry (entries) and the formatting of the pre-translated document (ibid-the document is displayed with the static content being static, and having the translated portions translated, C.4.lines 61-65-his displaying, C.4.lines 24-27).

As per **claims 4 and 20**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 1, and further teaches wherein the step of submitting the saved document to the selected translation service, further comprises:

sending the saved document to the selected translation service at a remote translation server via a distributed computing environment

(C.3.lines 61-67-his directing of the web server-distributive computing, C.9.lines 67-C.10.line 9, C.10.lines 57-67-his translation resource as the selected translation server).

As per **claim 5**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 1, and further discloses:

prior to the step of selecting a translation service from the list of translation services, further comprising the step of:

receiving a list of translation services (C.4.lines 31-47-his list of criteria appropriate to particular service, C.9.lines 15-20-his job tickets; and maintaining the list of translation services in a system registry (C.6.lines-36-40-his look-up scheme).

As per **claims 6 and 21**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 1, and further discloses wherein the step of requesting an identification for the selected translation service includes the steps of:

requesting a uniform resource locator (URL) for the selected translation service, including sending an HTTP GET request for the URL (C.16.lines 25-35-his requesting of a URL for the selected translation service, specifying the language selection, C.15.lines 20-26-“Get” request,

C.19.lines 65-67, “request”, as it is necessary to the translation and inherent over the Internet, when a user enters a URL into a browser, the browser constructs an HTTP GET request which contains the URL and other HTTP client header information).

As per **claim 7**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 1, and further discloses wherein the step of creating a saved document, further comprises the step of:

saving the pre-translated document in HTML format, including HTML tags defining the formatting of the pre-translated document and HTML tags pointing to the non-text entry saved in the temporary storage medium (C.7.lines 30-35, C.9.lines 1-3-his translation queues, C.10.lines 15-20 “the documents original format HTML”, Fig 12, C.5.lines 34-42 and C.5.line 63-C.6.line 5-HTML tag, C.7.lines 10-12-his static HTML content, C.5.lines 7-11 and C.6.lines 29-C.7.line 12, inherently called to complete the translation in order to have the translated document which includes the “language-specific elements, and static HTML content”);

As per **claims 8 and 22**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 1, and further discloses wherein the step of submitting the saved document to the selected translation service, further comprises the step of:

sending to the selected translation service an HTTP POST request containing parameters associated with the translation service and containing the saved document (ibid-saved document, C.15.lines 10-26-language parameters are in the post request, "GET/cnv.post/English...", posting as is inherent to a destination server accepting a request for the entity within a request, the entity containing the parameters, inherent to Lakritz, C.19.lines 65-C.20.line 8-in the direction to server, with language parameters, from the browser).

As per **claims 9 and 23**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 8, and further discloses wherein the step of sending to the selected translation service an HTTP POST request, further comprises the step of:

sending the HTTP POST request (ibid) via an Internet browser (C.3.lines 21-45, especially lines 31, C.2.lines 65-67-"visitors browser") across a distributed computing environment whereby the selected translation service is resident in a remote translation server (ibid of claim 4 above, wherein the translation resources which performs the translation interpreted as the translation server, is remote, C.10.lines 51, 53).

As per **claim 12**, Lakritz discloses a method of communicating between a client process and a server process in a distributed processing system for providing remote processing, comprising the steps of:

issuing, by the client process, an HTTP GET request call having a plurality of call parameters, comprising a translation service identifier (C.16.lines 11-25-his ability to call/request several documents ",C.15.lines 20-26-"Get" request, C.19.lines 65-67, "request", as it is necessary to the translation and inherent over the Internet, when a user enters a URL into a browser, the browser constructs an HTTP GET request which contains the URL and other HTTP client header information), a "from" language identifier and a "to" language identifier (C.15.lines 10-26, C.16.lines 25-35-request, C.19.lines 45-51) ;

receiving, by a first server process, the HTTP GET request call and parsing the call to retrieve the parameters (C.19.lines 65-67-request to webplexer, C.14.lines 22-24-his webplexer "processing" as parsing for parameters, C.17.lines 6-16-parameters);

issuing, by the first server process (C.19.lines 65-67-his browser request to the Webplexer), an HTTP GET request acknowledgement having a uniform resource locator (URL) of a second server process

(C.19.line 65-C.20.line-8-his request, is acknowledged by second server process, his “map” link);

saving a pre-translated document including non-text entries and formatting as an HTML formatted document, the HTML formatted document including tags for the formatting of the pre-translated document and tags linking the HTML formatted document to non-text entries in the pre-translated document (ibid, C.7.lines 30-35-“storing”, C.9.lines 1-3-his translation queues, C.10.lines 15-20 “the documents original format HTML”, Fig 12, C.5.lines 34-42 and C.5.line 63-C.6.line 5-HTML tag, C.7.lines 10-12-his static HTML content)

issuing, by the client process (ibid, “user”), an HTTP POST request call (C.15.lines 10-26-his post, language parameters are in the post request, including “GET/cnv.post/English...”, posting, the entity containing the parameters specifying the posted document, further, C.19.lines 65-C.20.line 8-in the direction to server, with language parameters, from the browser, C.9.lines 15-25, 64-C.10.line 20-his posted and teaching of posted document as it relates to HTML) having a plurality of call parameters comprising a remote processing service provider identifier (C.4.lines 21-31-his “sufficient information to identify...” as identifying

information, C.9.lines 45-48-the remote processing service as his translation resource, C.9.line 64-C.10.line 7-including his translation resource with attached information), a user interface language identifier (ibid), a processing service identifier (ibid, C.15.lines 10-26), and further comprising a data body including the HTML formatted document requiring remote processing, the HTML formatted document requiring processing according to the processing service identifier (ibid, C.7.lines 30-35-“storing”, C.9.lines 1-3-his translation queues, C.10.lines 15-20 “the documents original format HTML”, Fig 12, C.5.lines 34-42 and C.5.line 63-C.6.line 5-HTML tag, C.7.lines 10-12-his static HTML content);

receiving, by the second server process, the HTTP POST request call and parsing the call to retrieve the parameters (ibid-the call parameters within the URL, “info, English-American”, etc., the first server process, C.20.lines 5-8-required in the translation of the original document from the first server process, the receiving of the HTTP Post request call and parsing for the parameters in order to identify the languages desired to be translated from and to, within the URL request/call); and

issuing, by the second server process, an HTTP POST request acknowledgement having a plurality of acknowledgement parameters

comprising a user interface language identifier, a processing service identifier, and the HTML formatted document processed according to the processing service identifier and represented in HTML format (ibid-the steps above required in translation with regards to the user interface identifier, the processing services identifier...).

but lacks saving a pre-translated document including non-text entries and formatting as an HTML formatted document, the HTML formatted document including tags for the formatting of the pre-translated document and tags linking the HTML formatted document to non-text entries in the pre-translated document, *instead of the HTML formatted document including the non-text entries*;

However, Lissauer teaches the lacking elements, saving...instead of the document including the non-text entries. (C.4.lines 15-29-"it only stores the path ..."). Therefore, at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Lakritz's stored document by storing only the paths to non-text entries. The motivation for doing so would have been to save memory space.

As per **claim 13**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 12, and further discloses wherein:

the remote processing service provider identifier includes a translation service identifier (C.20.lines 1-5, 31-35-his URL including WPCCommand) ;

the processing service identifier includes a "from" language identifier and a "to" language identifier (C.20.lines 1, 2-his from English to French, identified in the URL); and

the processed HTML document includes the HTML formatted document translated from the "from" language to the "to" language (C.19.line 65-C.20.line 13).

As per **claim 14**, Lakritz discloses a system for submitting an originally-formatted document to a remote translation service, comprising:

a word processing module operative (C.3.lines 61-67- his visitors module),

to request from a redirection server a URL of a translation server (ibid-his direction of the web server, C.18.lines 58-67, C.19.line 65-C.20.lines 5-his "map" as redirection);

to receive from the redirection server the URL (ibid, C.20.lines 58-his "returned" document which requires the URL);

to save an original document requiring translation from a first language to a second language (C.7.lines 30-35), such that non-text entries and formatting of the original document are saved to a temporary storage medium (ibid, C.7.lines 10-13-his static HTML content, as the non-text entries, HTML-format), and such that the saved document includes paths to the non-text entries and formatting of the original document saved to the temporary storage medium (ibid, C.4.lines 24-37-inherent to the “viewed in the context of the form in which it was originally entered”);

an Internet browser module operative (C.19.lines 65-67),

to receive the saved document from the word processing module (ibid, C.9.lines 1-3-documents to be translated-queued, C.7.lines 31-35-“stored”);

to send the saved document to a remote translation server (C.10.lines 51-52-his translation resource) via a distributed computing environment (C.20.lines 1-5-the “map” location, C.10.lines 6-8-his translation resource as the remote translation server);

to receive a translation of the saved document from the remote translation server (C.20.lines 6-8-his returned translation);

to display the translation of the saved document, including a display of the non-text entries and formatting from the original document in the translation of the saved document (C.4.lines 24-27); and

the remote translation server operative (C.10.lines 1-10-his translation resource),

to receive from the Internet browser module the saved document (C.19.lines 65-his “English document”, C.9.lines 1-3-documents to be translated-queued, C.7.lines 31-35-“stored”)

to translate the saved document (C.10.lines 50-63); and
to return the translation of the saved document to the Internet browser module (C.20.lines 6-10-his webplexer, C.13.lines 20-35-wherein the webplexer is the communication means of the translation resource, C.10.lines 1-67-his transmission of completed packets),

but lacks the saved document includes paths to the non-text entries and formatting of the original document saved to the temporary storage medium, *instead of the saved document including the non-text entries of the original document.*

However, Lissauer teaches the lacking elements, saving paths...instead..., (C.4.lines 15-29-“it only stores the path ...”). Therefore,

at the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to modify Lakritz's stored document by storing only the paths to non-text entries. The motivation for doing so would have been to save memory space.

As per **claims 15**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 14, and further teaches wherein: the redirection server is operative,

to receive service and language parameters from the word processing module (C.3.lines 61-65-his language, C.18.lines 64-67); and

to return the identification of the remote translation server to the word processing module (C.20.lines 1-8-the identification of the remote translation server lies in the address returned to the browser, which is includes the visitors module or word processing module, C.3.lines 61-67)).

As per **claims 16**, Lakritz discloses dependent claim 14, and further teaches the word processing module is further operative

to retrieve a list of translation services from an operating system registry (C.4.lines 21-38-his manual selection, C.6.lines 28-37-his look-up scheme as a registry, and user designation of information, C.16.lines 10-30-including his directory); and

to display the list of translation services (C.15.line 59-C.16.line 30-his "directory", manual "language selection" by user, and "web browser" as the display).

Conclusion

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lamont M. Spooner whose telephone number is 571/272-7613. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571/272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

lms
8/2/06



RICHEMOND DORVIL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER